

METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607-4700 TEL 510.817.5700 TDD/ITY 510.817.5769 FAX 510.817.5848 E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

DATE: January 28, 2010

Memorandum

TO: Partnership Transit Coordination Committee (PTCC)

FR: Executive Director W. I. 1223

RE: Transit Coordination Implementation Plan (MTC Resolution 3866): Comments and Revisions

This memorandum describes the themes most frequently voiced in the comments we received on draft Res. 3866 and explains our strategy to respond to these comments. Attached is:

- Revised Res. 3866, in "track changes" (Attachment 1); and
- Disposition Matrix, which summarizes stakeholder comments and MTC response (Attachment 2).

Overview of Comments

MTC received approximately 133 comments from 19 transit agencies and two MTC advisory committees. Of these comments, 31 were not included in the Disposition Matrix because they either focused on project-specific issues rather than coordination requirements or duplicated written comments. After the draft was released for stakeholder review, MTC staff identified 7 additional issues to add or clarify in the Resolution. To ensure transparency, staff added these to the Disposition Matrix and identified MTC as the Commenter for these items. The final number of comments in the Disposition Matrix is 109. Comments are organized by topic, with similar comments grouped together, and generally follow the order covered in Res. 3866.

The volume of comments speaks to the complexity of coordinating service between and among multiple transit agencies. With this backdrop, staff generally kept coordination requirements focused on the "big picture" and could not accommodate every individual agency request which would have undermined our goal of creating meaningful regional requirements. Nonetheless, staff tried to be flexible where possible.

While a wide variety of comments were submitted, a few themes emerged:

1. Consultation Process – Some transit agencies felt review time was insufficient and sought clarity to MTC's approach to consulting with transit agencies and the PTCC. In response, MTC scheduled another PTCC meeting and rewrote the consultation process. In general, the process will be to consult with TACs when developing draft policy (or other advisory groups when there is no relevant TAC). Once drafted, MTC will solicit feedback from the PTCC. At its discretion, MTC may also solicit feedback from other committees during the review process. Lastly, MTC will forward staff's recommendation to the Operations Committee and full Commission for approval.

- 2. Cost Sharing Some transit agencies emphasized the challenging economic times, and requested MTC to provide funds for operations and maintenance costs. A few also requested detailed project cost assumptions, including transit agency costs resulting from the coordination requirements, to inform regional discussions on project priorities and tradeoffs. MTC agrees that transit funding is under stress, but believes that many of the O&M responsibilities are not significant compared to other operating costs, have been established for a while now, and should have been planned.
- 3. *Transit Sustainability Issues* Some comments addressed issues beyond the scope of Res. 3866 that MTC will refer for consideration as part of the Transit Sustainability Project scope of work, including: fare policy; paratransit policies; assessment of costs agencies incur for coordination projects; common look for buses; and funding for feeder bus services.
- 4. Fare Policy Control Some transit agencies asserted that Res. 3866 infringes on their right to set fare policy. MTC has made revisions to Res. 3866 to clarify our intent. Res. 3866 does not limit the right of transit operators to make fare policy decisions. However, if a transit agency approves a fare policy, fare payment system or fare product which is detrimental to the TransLink® program, it does so at risk of being found in non-compliance with the Commission's coordination policy.
- 5. TransLink® Fare Media Transition Dates Transit agencies requested delays in transition dates for fare media products to TransLink®-only availability in support of the requirement that TransLink® be the primary non-cash fare payment system in the region. MTC worked with individual transit agencies to assess their requests against MTC's goals and made changes where appropriate.

MTC staff responds more fully to the above comments in Attachment 2 and has made changes to Res. 3866 with respect to these and other comments as appropriate.

New Requirements

As a result of transit agency feedback and further reflection, MTC staff added four new requirements in Res. 3866 to the Disposition Matrix:

- 1. *TransLink*[®] *Equipment Replacement* clarifies responsibilities related to equipment replacement and ownership.
- 2. *TransLink*[®] *Employee Training and Customer Service* confirms ongoing training and customer service expectations for front line maintenance and customer service staff.
- 3. *TransLink*® *Transition to Clipper*SM confirms support for the brand name change.
- 4. *Hub Signage Program Standards Applicability* ensures consultation with MTC early in the planning process for applicability of regional sign standards to new facilities or station remodels.

MTC is particularly interested in transit agency feedback on these new requirements at the next PTCC meeting since they were not part of draft Res. 3866 released on November 18, 2009.

Final Comments

Final comments on draft Res. 3866 should be submitted in writing to the attention of Pierce Gould at MTC or via email at pgould@mtc.ca.gov by noon on Wednesday, February 10, 2010. This date/time is firm because of the need to quickly review and process them in time for the February 12, 2010 Operations Committee meeting. Ultimately, staff will seek Commission approval of Res. 3866 on February 24, 2010. Feel free to contact Pierce with questions at 510.817.5863.

Steve Heminger

J:\COMMITTE\PTCC-TCC\02_08_10 Meeting\02_08_10 PTCC Res 3866 Comments - cover memo final.doc